1	which is a series of attempts at cooperation but
2	if there's a hard time, we can ask you?
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Anybody can ask me if
4	somebody is giving them a hard time.
5	MR. LIEBERMAN: Thank you.
6	MR. LIEBERMAN: Anybody. You know,
7	that's just not that's taboo because I'm the
8	only judge in town and, you know, I just don't
9	have time for that kind of business. There's a
10	lot of business in this case. That's one of them
11	I don't want to have to deal with but I will deal
12	with it. And I think we've got an agreement.
13	Now, I was going to get to you with
14	the petitioner's aspect. Why does the petitioner
15	need any information? • What are you going to do
16	with it? What's your issue here?
17	MR. LIEBERMAN: The petitioners,
18	Warren Havens and his related companies plan to
19	take an active role in this proceeding
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Why?
21	MR. LIEBERMAN: because it's their
22	position that the licenses should be terminated

and that that termination should make them void ab initio and, therefore, we plan to, hope to participate in the hearing on the same side as the Bureau to in a sense prosecute the case against Maritime so that the licenses will be terminated and voided ab initio. Well, let me see if I JUDGE SIPPEL: understand how this came about. Is Mr. Havens and I know that he's at seven companies, Ι believe, that are not only in this case. MR. LIEBERMAN: Right. In one way shape or form. JUDGE SIPPEL: And he was put in a Was this by virtue of the same statute or is this a different authority? A different authority. MS. KANE: And can you just kind JUDGE SIPPEL: of paraphrase for me? Does that say, will, may or --Pursuant to the fact that MS. KANE: he had several petitions to deny against many of the applications, if not all of the applications

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 at issue. 2 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. MS. KANE: In addition to Maritime's 3 4 application for the Auction 61 spectrum. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. 5 MR. LIEBERMAN: If I may add to that, 6 the Havens parties we're the second highest 7 bidders in the auctions, at least in some of the 8 auctions so their position is that if these 9 authorizations are voided ab initio, then the 10 Havens parties are next in line to be 11 licensee of this spectrum, number one. And 12 number two, the petition to deny they filed at 13 of the auction 14 the time of the end and preparatory to the grant, that's still pending on 15 application for review. In other words, the 16 17 petition to deny was dismissed but the Havens parties filed an application for review with the 18 Commission which is still pending. 19 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: And that's why you're in the case under the statute? 21 MR. LIEBERMAN: Well, we're in the 22

1 case because we're a party in interest and the 2 application for review that's still pending we believe should be consolidated with this case and 3 we plan to file a motion in that regard because 4 5 it's the same issues. The application, 6 Havens and his companies, their petitions to deny and their application for review put before the 7 Bureau, the Commission, the same facts that the 8 Bureau has now found on subsequent investigation 9 to be cause for an Order to Show Cause and the 10 Hearing Designation Order. It's the same basic 11 facts. 12 They basically flushed JUDGE SIPPEL: 13 your case out for you in a sense. 14 15 MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes. Right. yet our case is still technically pending on 16 application for review. So, we are a party to 17 the proceeding because in a sense we're the party 18 other than the Bureau that's prosecuting the case 19 against the Maritime entities. 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: But if you lose on your 21 petition for reconsideration --

1	MR. LIEBERMAN: Well, it is an
2	application for review that's pending that's been
3	pending for a year and a half, I believe, perhaps
4	more. I'm sorry, four years. It's been pending
5	for four years.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what's a few
7	years well, what I'm trying to figure out is
8	if it's a reconsideration. Is it a
9	reconsideration for
10	MR. LIEBERMAN: It's an application
11	for review.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Review. Okay.
13	MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, the reason I'm
15	asking that is that if you lose up there, you can
16	go right to the Court of Appeals, can't you?
17	MR. LIEBERMAN: Right, but it's in the
18	Commission's interest to have the same set of
19	facts considered in one case rather than two
20	cases, because if we prevail on our application
21	for review theoretically, there would be a
22	hearing designation order or else simply taking

1	away the license making this whole hearing moot.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: That might be
3	consolidated as a second case, but
4	MR. LIEBERMAN: That's our goal.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: It seems to me that
6	you're shoe-horning yourself into this one now
7	preliminary to what the Commission might want to
8	do.
9	MR. LIEBERMAN: Well, we're not shoe-
10	horning. We're named in the designation order.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, you are. I know
12	that.
13	MR. LIEBERMAN: Number one.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Going here.
15	MR. LIEBERMAN: And number two we have
16	the same interest the Bureau does which is that
17	these that certain conduct took place or
18	didn't take place that is cause for revocation of
19	the licenses but we would perhaps go further than
20	the Bureau, perhaps, to say that the revocation
21	II
21	should make these licenses void ab initio and,

ante as the second highest bidder in the auction. 1 JUDGE SIPPEL: And you want me to say 2 going, going gone? 3 MR. LIEBERMAN: Well, we're not sure 4 at this moment whether that's within the scope of 5 this hearing designation order but it would be if 6 this case were consolidated with our pending 7 application for review which, of course, we'll 8 submit papers with arguments on that point. 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. 10 I just want 11 to grasp what's here. I just want to say two 12 MR. KELLER: things. One and I'll defer to the Bureau on this 13 but I think it's safe to say that while I can't 14 give you any guarantees, it's extremely unlikely 15 the Commission is going to act on the application 16 17 for review while this hearing is pending because the application for review is an application for 18 review of dismissal of a protest against the 19 application that resulted in this license. The 20 license is now before you to be possibly revoked. 21

So, the likelihood that the Commission could rule

on that application review in the interim is almost nonexistent.

Secondly, just for the record, I would dispute the Havens parties claim that they factually may or may not be the second highest bidder in one or more of these auctions. But that does not automatically entitle them to the license where these applications go down. The Commission also has the option to re-auction the spectrum in a new auction. So, any claim to the spectrum as a result of this revocation is speculative and would, again, be an 84 question anyway not decided in this hearing.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you for that clarification. I don't mean to say that -- I'm just trying to understand this, you know, in sort of a big picture way. Who is here? Someone want to talk here? All right.

Now, let me just go back again to the Bureau.

What is your position with respect to all that? What is your position with respect to

1	Mr. Havens being actively in this case?
2	MS. KANE: It is our understanding,
3	Your Honor, that by virtue of the fact that he
4	has filed a petition to deny against the very
5	applications that are designated, he is entitled
6	to full party status in this hearing.
7	With regard to the timing of the
8	application of review consideration and any of
9	that, that is not for us to comment on.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you feel that
11	he's entitled to full party status in here. Even
12	fuller party than the applicants?
13	MS. KANE: No, actually, the same full
14	party status that the applicants or the assignees
15	are entitled to but which they do not appear to
16	wish to participate in.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. I'm just
18	confusing myself. But, okay, I hear your answer.
19	Let me put it to you this way again.
20	I got the same interest. I got the same interest
21	in limiting the participation of the petitioner
22	parties for the same reason. I don't want this

case to get more complicated and confusing than I'm not convinced that Mr. it needs to be. Lieberman can't wait until you develop your case and the reason, I'll talk to Mr. Lieberman The reason is because you directly on that. still got your rights up to the Commission. No matter what gets done down here, or let me put it another way. If you have particular information that the Bureau doesn't have, if you can bring to this case light that the Bureau can't, shed light on it in terms of factual information that we participation active need. then your as participation as a party in my estimation would be different. But if you're just going to be here to duplicate what the Commission counsel is doing, well, that doesn't make much sense. MR. LIEBERMAN: On one hand, Your Honor--To me it doesn't. JUDGE SIPPEL: I can assure you that MR. LIEBERMAN: we'll cooperate with the Bureau 100 percent to make sure we're not both doing the same thing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

before you in a hearing. On the other hand, although our interest in general is the same as the Bureau, as the Bureau up to a point, certainly a private party is perhaps free to make arguments or put in evidence that a governmental agency may not want to bring in or put in for its own internal reasons.

We don't know everything internal that the Bureau is aware of and, for example, we have Mr. Havens has a pending Freedom of Information Act request pending at the Commission for a long time that hasn't been responded to. So the Bureau has more information than we do or perhaps different information than we do.

On the other hand, the same can be said of Mr. Havens who we believe has the right in this proceeding to undertake his own discovery, investigation and put forth evidence that perhaps the Bureau chooses not to put forth or for one reason or another can't put forth. So, we believe we have full rights to participate as in a sense a co-prosecutor with the Bureau as

a private outside party who is the petitioner who got this whole thing started.

Well, JUDGE SIPPEL: Ι not convinced of the accuracy of that statement -the breadth of that statement. You do have rights as a participant in some way shape or form and I'm trying to pare it down to the minimum but I don't want to take any rights away from you. As I say, if you've got a theory backed by some facts that the Bureau doesn't have, and you want to come in as a party on that particular matter, this term "party" is confusing aqain, everything because you are a party. I'm talking about an active participant party that's not going to be duplicative of what the Bureau is saying.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Well, as I said, we will work with the Bureau and not be duplicative but we also have a strong interest in making sure that the Bureau puts forth what evidence there is because it was Mr. Havens who filed the Petition to Deny, that the Bureau denied, a different

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Bureau. But filed a petition for reconsideration that was denied and has pending an application for review which I agree with what's already been said. I am confident that the Commission won't act on that application for review while this proceeding is pending.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you know, it's kind of like in a catch-22 situation that I want to give a lot of hard thought to.

Mr. Keller?

MR. KELLER: Yes, I wanted to comment on a couple of things of what Mr. Lieberman said and also something the Bureau said earlier. Again, I seem to be spending all my time stating things for the record, but I don't want my silence to be implied that I agree with some of these things.

I do not believe and I take issue with the argument that Havens and the Havens parties are entitled as a matter of right to party status in the participation in the hearing. Their role in this hearing is as a petitioner to deny under

Section 309(d) of the Act.

The applicant parties have a right to a hearing under Section 309(e) and so, therefore, we and the other applicant parties have that right and also us under Section 312 as a license subject to revocation.

What happens is as a petition to deny, the Havens parties may have a right to intervene in the hearing. They may have a right to seek intervention in the hearing but it would then the discretion of the judge or the Commission as to whether to grant that intervention. So, the hearing designation order doesn't name a party but I view that as nothing more than the same thing you might have done afterwards in granting a motion to intervene. That being the case, I think you also within your full discretion to limit participation as you see fit for the conduct of the hearing.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's where I was going with this but as I said, I don't want to draw a line in the sand just yet. I view your

participation and it's kind of like because you are "a party" it would be an analogous situation. But there is a provision in the Rules for Intervention that you can come in, even though you might not have a particular party interest as it's defined, but you do have information. And the Commission wants all the relevant information on anything that is going to shed light on this issue and we don't care what your motive might be or where you've coming from. I want credibility, of course, but that's not an issue. So, that's what I'm coming from.

Now, I'll tell you what I would like because this thing it's got me confused and I think that there's a way of clearing this up.

If you wouldn't mind, Mr. Keller, if you would file a motion in the nature of limiting Mr. Havens participation as a party, however, you want to phrase this thing and go down and make the same points that you were just making with whatever authority you can find. And then, Mr. Lieberman, you respond to that and let's see.

It's going to put me in a better position to make a decision. Like I say, I want to give you whatever assurance you can that I don't want to cut -- I don't want to cut you out if you've got a way that can add to this case with evidence, argument, whatever you may feel. But on the other hand, Mr. Keller, Duquesne and -- I'm sorry, let me start here. Maritime certainly has an interest in not getting double teamed and that kind of thing and so I want to-- the only way I can start this out is by getting control of the open question.

Secondly, of course, the Bureau I want you to comment on that. When both pleadings come in, in other words, there's going to be a motion. There's going to an opposition. You comment on the situation after you've seen all of that. Okay?

MS. KANE: We can do that, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: And I'll give you some
dates on that but let me think if there's
anything else that I wanted to cover on that.

Oh, the other thing, you are giving me 1 2 a little bit of concern with your argument, Mr. Lieberman, is that the Bureau has to share all of 3 their case files with you. 4 5 MR. LIEBERMAN: That is right. That's 6 exactly right. JUDGE SIPPEL: They are the -- okay. 7 I think that's understood. 8 9 MR. LIEBERMAN: We will cooperate 100 they don't 10 percent. But have to everything they have. 11 JUDGE SIPPEL: It's kind of a one-way 12 street in a sense. Of course, you know, you want 13 to work out timing and a lot of other things too 14 15 and there is a lot of evidence that they have that you probably will get access to one way or 16 the other. But you've got to be perfectly candid 17 with them and give them everything. 18 MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes. 19 The good, bad and the JUDGE SIPPEL: 20 And, you know, take it from there. 21 22 mean, you're right. It would be an assist to

them to have you perhaps present that phase of it. Some how or another I want to get it in the record if it's obviously if it's relevant evidence to the issue and it's reliable evidence.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, in terms of the applicant, I'm not saying we would but would we be able to if we so -- a couple of us ought to comment on the pleadings that you just --

JUDGE SIPPEL: Please do.

MR. MILLER: -- asked because we have an interest in protecting whatever participation the Havens group may have with respect to our client. And we would like, if we decided to do that, we would like the opportunity to present that on the record so you can make a ruling on that.

JUDGE SIPPEL: I'll permit that. But then that's going to back it up a little bit because Mr. Lieberman has to have a full deck before he has to submit an opposition. But I want to limit the briefing on this, you know, to

1 just a few pages. 2 MR. MILLER: Or, you know, it's possible then that we might, you know, work with 3 Maritime -- whatever it is to consolidate as long 4 as the issues are before you. 5 6 JUDGE SIPPEL: Certainly. MR. MILLER: We can certainly do that 7 as well. 8 JUDGE SIPPEL: Certainly, because that 9 does tie in with the other concern that I've seen 10 here and that is there's been several requests 11 for a protective order. And the nature of the 12 protective order seems to be one of avoiding 13 harassment or, you know, repeated requests and 14 that kind of thing. 15 MR. MILLER: Yes. 16 JUDGE SIPPEL: That's a different kind 17 of protective order than -- well, there's the 18 19 other kind, you know, for commercial information, So, I'm going to try and catch that 20 what not. one right up front also and whatever order I end 21

up issuing on Mr. Havens' issue, I hope to be

able to also cover -- well, it doesn't have to be in that context. But when you're working out a proposed schedule which is what I want to happen work the after this, that you out also understanding with the parties are going to cooperate with you in discovery. Like, you know, we're back to that question again. All right. The bifurcation and you're afraid of losing some kind of leverage to get the discovery you need.

MS. KANE: Well, just losing our ability to actually seek discovery from the assignees and, if necessary, from Mr. Havens.

you that you're going to have it. I'm giving you the opportunity to work this out in either a proposed stipulation or a submission to me of what it is that you need and I'll consider it and reduce it to an order. My preference would be that it be a stipulation between you and the -- it would be primarily, I guess, the applicant parties.

MS. KANE: I don't foresee any

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 difficulty in trying to work that out with them, Your Honor, not after you've instructed them 2 3 accordingly. JUDGE SIPPEL: No, as I say, we've 4 been down that road so it's just a question of 5 the form to do it in and I think a stipulation 6 would work but I'm going to leave that up to you 7 and counsel. 8 I'm not sure how this is going to 9 Lieberman, but the Havens 10 affect you, Mr. situation. Basically, it would be, I think, the 11 same thing. You just have to sign on to whatever 12 the procedure is for cooperating with the Bureau 13 on discovery and I think you're -- so, I think 14 that's all we really have. 15 And then the next thing I need is a 16 proposed schedule for completing discovery. 17 Your Honor, we had taken 18 MS. KANE: 19 the liberty of proposing a schedule and we have 20 that for you. We're happy to hand it up to you if you'd like unless you had --21

No.

JUDGE SIPPEL:

1	MS. KANE: Okay. Is it appropriate if
2	we provide
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Have the other parties
4	got the procedure?
5	MS. KANE: We've discussed it with
6	them. We have not shown them the actual dates
7	but we have copies for everybody that we could
8	circulate.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, why don't you
10	okay. Why don't you, okay. Why don't we do
11	that.
12	MR. MILLER: Your Honor, were you
13	going to set up a schedule for the pleadings we
14	were just talking about?
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am.
16	MR. MILLER: Okay.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am. I'm going to
18	give a little more time than I would otherwise
19	give because yes, I'm going to set the
20	schedule. Oh, really, is this eight months
21	discovery. Do you need that much?
22	MS. KANE: Well, Your Honor our

concern obviously is that we have a lot of issues that have been designated for under the HDO. have 10 issues in particular, many of which are very complicated and involve multiple Maritime entities and real parties in interest and their Even by the information we have parties. looking least 15 currently, we're at at depositions, if not more than that. And history has shown as it has been put forth in the HDO difficult Maritime has been very in that providing complete discovery complete orinformation and we're fearful that we're going to them repeatedly and to qo to unfortunately, appear before you for some sort of relief and we were concerned that truncated discovery schedule would preclude us from obtaining that information.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay. Then let me ask, Mr. Keller, what's your reaction to this?

MR. KELLER: Well, I have discussed this with the Bureau, the Bureau discussed this with me last week, I think, and I too was a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

little surprised a the length of it, you know. Ι would, my druthers might be to push this back a few months but then we'd be during the hearing--I don't think a hearing date before the end of the year is probably realistic. But to make it much earlier than this then we're going to be doing a hearing in February or something which might not be good with weather. So, I guess I'm sort of neutral on this schedule. I have no problem with it. JUDGE SIPPEL: Does anybody have a problem? MR. HULL: Your Honor? JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir. fundamental The most MR. **HULL:** problem I have with this is that it was prepared prior to determining that we were going to And so this provides bifurcate the proceeding. for only one hearing, one discovery period, one everything. So, if we're going to bifurcate it, I think we need to compress this on the front end and then we can work out the schedule for the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	later follow on piece of that if that's even
2	necessary.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, you mean for the
4	penalty phase?
5	MR. HULL: Yes. And this seems to
6	have been created in anticipation that there
7	would be the numerous issues that counsel had
8	identified but we seem to at least have carved
9	off one significant piece of those.
10	MS. KANE: Your Honor, I just want to
11	clarify.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. Thank you.
13	No, that's an important point.
14	MS. KANE: I understand that but I
15	just want to clarify. I had not heard that you
16	had instructed a bifurcated discovery schedule.
17	Simply that the assignees
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, there is no
19	bifurcated discovery schedule.
20	MS. KANE: Okay. Because I believe
21	that
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's bifurcated in the